

THE UNKNOWN ARAMAIC ORIGINAL OF THEODOT- TION'S ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

BY DR. GASTER.

*Reprinted from the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology,"
November, December, 1894, and February, 1895.*

I.—INTRODUCTION.

It is an universally admitted fact, which no one acquainted with the Greek translations of the Bible will venture to contradict, that the real work of Theodotion consisted in correcting and altering the old Greek translation known as the LXX, in accordance with the Hebrew text. Not much has been preserved of that improved edition of the LXX made by Theodotion, but the fragments alone would suffice to show his absolute dependence upon the Hebrew original.

Much more clearly is this fact evidenced by the whole book of Daniel, which has come down to us entirely in Theodotion's version. The translation of the LXX must have deviated very much from the original, so much so as to induce the Church from very ancient times to eliminate it from the official service, and to substitute for it that other translation of Theodotion. (The LXX text has, as is well known, come to light in the last century, and has been often reprinted.) The differences extend also to the apocryphal additions, which are missing in our canon, at any rate in the Hebrew canon of the Scriptures. These differences do not appear to be very great, but it is questionable whether Theodotion's text has not been altered after that of the LXX. Even in this form there are, however, marked differences which cannot be explained, unless we admit that Theodotion had a certain original before his eyes, exactly as was the case with the rest of the book. He corrected and amended the old translation, being guided by the language of that original. It would appear, otherwise, at least singular that he should have attempted a similar process of correction, if there was not such an original text to guide him. The presumption, *à priori*, is, therefore, that also for those portions which are now counted among the Apocrypha an original in a Semitic

dialect must have existed, and that this was used by Theodotion when he undertook to amend the LXX version.

I do not think that one can lay great stress on the suggestion thrown out by Lengerke,* that these apocryphal additions have been interpolated at a later time from the LXX into Theodotion, as this would lead to a far more complicated question, viz., how to explain these differences in those two texts.

First, as to the "Song of the Three Children." Many a scholar has thought that he could detect traces of such an ancient Semitic original in peculiarities of the language. De Wette-Schrader† has collected all these peculiarities of the Greek which would point to such an original. They can best be explained by comparing them with words or forms that may have been misunderstood by the translator, or by his being influenced by the forms of that language, which may have been an Aramaic dialect akin to that of Daniel—and yet does De Wette doubt the existence of such an original. Schuerer, who devotes a whole chapter to the study of these additions to Daniel,‡ sums up his judgment in these words: "There is no reason to believe in a Hebrew original for any of these texts." It is doubtful whether he meant a purely Hebrew or an original written in any *Semitic* dialect, since, properly speaking, one could say that there is no Hebrew original for the greater part of the Book of Daniel, as it contains so many chapters written in Aramaic. Much more decided is De Wette in his opinion about the origin of the other additions, such as the history of Bel and that of the Dragon. He, as well as Fritzsche,§ say that there is not the slightest foundation for the idea that there was a Hebrew, or, as the latter adds, an Aramaic original for these. The differences between Theodotion and the LXX are, however, much more pronounced in these other portions than in the Song, and, as far as I have been able to see, no theory has hitherto been vouchsafed by any of these scholars that could give a satisfactory explanation of these discrepancies. If they are not to be explained by a difference of translation, how, and for what reason should Theodotion have gone out of his way to alter the old-established version; and why

* Das Buch Daniel; Königsberg, 1835, p. 108.

† Lehrbuch d. histor.-Kritischen Einleitung, 8th ed.; Berlin, 1869, p. 509.

‡ Geschichte des juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu, 2d ed., ii, pp. 716-720.

§ Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen; Leipzig, 1851, p. 121, § 12.

should the Church feel it proper to accept this latter, if not for their conviction that this way is a more faithful rendering of the original? Delitzsch, in his study on Habakkuk,* has already drawn attention to a fragment of the Bel legend in an old Hebrew Midrash quoted by Raymundus Martini in the 13th century. The same has since been discovered by Dr. Neubauer in another fragment of the same Midrash Major, as that book is called. He has published this legend, together with the Aramaic version of the Book of Tobit.† The language of this text, however, is more like Syriac than Aramaic, and it differs in many important details from the old Greek versions. It can, therefore, not be considered as the probable original from which those translations have been made. They go, on the other hand, a long way to prove the existence of these legends in a Semitic dialect.

Another proof is furnished by the fact that all the additions to Daniel are found also in the Hebrew Josephus, better known as Josippon. We have there the throwing of Daniel into the den of the lions, and the prophet Habakkuk drawn by the lock of his hair from Palestine to feed him in that pit,‡ then the history of Bel,§ and that of the Dragon.|| As will be seen afterwards, these portions were in the oldest known MS. of Josippon, and form part of that book; they are not later additions or interpolations, but belong to the body of that work. As the question concerning Josippon is still an open one, and its relation to the Greek Josephus not yet sufficiently cleared up, I prefer not to take this parallel as a proof for the antiquity of these texts. They suffice to prove, however, the existence of Semitic parallels to the apocryphal additions to Daniel. It will become evident later on that the version contained in Josippon, which has some details which are wanting in the Greek versions both of the LXX and Theodotion, is not taken from these versions, but in every probability from the original Semitic source which served as basis to these Greek translations.

It is dangerous to dogmatise, and to try to settle definitely questions which later discoveries may easily upset. Such is the case with these additions to Daniel, which, as shown, are declared

* De Habacuci Prophetæ vita, etc.; Leipzig, 1842. pp. 32, 33.

† The Book of Tobit; Oxford, 1878, pp. 41, 42.

‡ Ed. Breithaupt, I, cap. x, xi, pp. 33-37.

§ *Ibid.*, cap. xiii, pp. 40-42.

|| *Ibid.*, cap. xiv, pp. 42-45.

by all the recognized authorities to be of a purely Greek, probably Alexandrian, origin, though it be extremely difficult to reconcile it with the fact that such texts were known in a Semitic language from ancient times.

I think now to have recovered that very original, the existence of which has hitherto been denied, on apparently insufficient grounds.

In the Chronicle of Jerahmeel, who lived somewhat about the 10th century, if not earlier, I have found an Aramaic text which is interesting from more than one point of view. The compiler of the Chronicle gives first a Hebrew translation of all those chapters in Daniel that are in Aramaic. Then follows a long rhymed introduction, after which the author says: "Now I am copying the missing praises and songs which praised and sang the three young men, which Theodosius found, and are not in the 24 (canonical) books. And this is the text (chapter) which Theodosius the wise man, who translated (the Bible) in the days of Commodus, the king of the Romans, introduced (arranged) in his Corpus (Canon)* It is not found in the book of the Hebrews but in that of the Seventy wise men, who translated the book of the Law together with Elazar the high priest, who was killed in the days of Antiochus (his bones may be ground to dust), who translated the whole Law in the days of Ptolomæus, king of Egypt; and the two men whose names were Symmachus and Akilas, who translated in the days of king Adrian, were translators (thereof) also. And Akilas is Onkelos."

"And this is the text of that which is not written in the Corpus (Canon) of the Hebrews and was found by Theodosius."

So far this remarkable introduction, which I have tried to render in a more intelligible form. The language is greatly involved and the meaning is not perfectly clear. But one point cannot be mistaken, viz., that the compiler wanted to convey the meaning that the text which he incorporated into his Chronicle was the one found or discovered by Theodosius. In order to understand fully the whole bearing of these few words, one must first settle the question as to who this great man Theodosius was, of whom Jerahmeel speaks with such a respect. I say that this *Todos* or Theodosius, as I

* I draw special attention to the word סִפְרָא used here, as this seems to be the exact equivalent of *κάνον*, and furnishes the best explanation of this term. I am preparing a special study on this term.

have translated this name, is no one else than *Theodotion*. It will at once be apparent why it is said that he *found* it. Bearing in mind the character of his work as a translator, that it consisted chiefly in adjusting the Greek text so as to reproduce the meaning of the Hebrew original more accurately, one can easily understand his anxiety to get hold also of the Hebrew or Aramaic originals of those portions which were not included in the Hebrew canon, but were to be found in the Greek of the LXX. Therefore it is said that he "found" this text, *i.e.*, he discovered the old original. A comparison between this Aramaic text and the Greek of Theodotion will soon convince us whether my conjecture is correct or not.

Before proceeding to this exegetical part, we have still to examine that introduction, which may yield some unexpected results. First again the name *Todos* and *Theodosius*. If this be identical with Theodotion, as I suggest, then this short notice will throw a flood of light on the history and biography of this otherwise very little known translator of the Bible. Hitherto all that was known is due to the short and not very clear notices of Irenæus, Hieronymus and Epiphanius, whose credibility has been doubted.* The only thing certain was that he must have lived before Irenæus (d. 202), *i.e.*, before the close of the second century. He may also have been a Jewish proselyte. Hieronymus makes him out to have been an Ebionite or *semi-christianus*. According to Epiphanius (Irenæus) he came from Ephesus, was originally a Marcionite, embraced afterwards Judaism, studied Hebrew, and made his translation in the time of the emperor Commodus. That is almost all that is known hitherto about this man. There is nothing improbable in the idea that Theodotion may have been a proselyte. Most if not all the Greek translations owe their origin to proselytes: such were Akilas and Symmachus. They felt more keenly the inadequacy of the existing translations, and strove after another which should render the Hebrew original in the most faithful manner, in order to have, if it were possible, the Hebrew original in a Greek garb. To the Jews the Greek was almost a matter of indifference; not so to those to whom Greek was their natural language, and who had to acquire the knowledge of Hebrew afterwards in life by hard work. Only such a motive will explain the number of Greek translations. The same may have been the primary motive for Theodotion to

* *Vide de Wette, l.c.*, p. 101.

improve the older and not sufficiently literal translation of the LXX.*

From the comparative obscurity and uncertainty as to the date and personality of Theodotion in which we are left by the writers of the Church, he is lifted out by this attempted identification of Theodotion or Theodot (so in some MSS.) with Todos, the popular and shorter form of the same name.

Todos is a man well known in Talmudic literature. He is mentioned in both the Talmuds at least five or six times, and always as a rich man and in high position. He is a munificent supporter of the wise men, and assists them materially.† “He used to give to the people of Rome the passah-lamb prepared in a peculiar manner, in the same way almost as it used to be prepared in Jerusalem, so that it looked like the sacrificial lamb. The sages sent word to him saying: ‘if thou wert not Todos, we would have excommunicated thee.’”‡

In all these passages it is R. Jose, (second half of the second century) who mentions this fact. In one place only the name of the rabbi who sent that threat is given as that of R. Simeon b. Shetah, of the time of Jannai the Makkabæan king;§ but this name has crept in from the other incident mentioned a few lines higher on the same page, and is undoubtedly a mistake of the writer or printer. The parallel passage in the Jerusalem Talmud (Moed katan) proves it also to be a mistake. From this passage two things are evident: (1) that Todos wished to observe the commandment of the passah-lamb in the strictest possible manner, so strictly in fact that he almost brought down upon himself the censure and possibly the anathema of the authorities. If anything, this is the characteristic of the proselyte, who is more strict in the observance of the law than the man born in it. In his anxiety to do what he considered to be

* Theodotion, or, as he is called in the same MSS., *Theodot*, stands probably for the Hebrew *Jonathan*. It is rather a peculiar coincidence that the Aramaic translation of the Prophets is ascribed to a Jonathan, who is identified in the Talmud with Jonathan, son of Uziel, pupil of Hillel. In a similar manner we have the Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch ascribed to Onkelos, the counterpart of Akilas. I do not intend laying any stress on this peculiar coincidence, beyond pointing out the parallelism in the names of the Greek and Aramaic translators of the Bible. Nor do I wish it to be understood that I identify Jonathan the Targumist with Theodotion.

† Tr. Pesahim, fol. 53^b, jer. Moed katan, III, § 1f, 81d.

‡ *L.c.*, v. Tr. Betzah, fol. 23a.

§ Tr. Berachoth, fol. 19a.

a divine commandment, he almost went beyond the Law; and (2) that the rabbis must have had a very strong reason to wink at his zeal, and deal leniently with his transgression. The reason thereof is not given in the Talmud; it is said only that he was a munificent supporter of the rabbis. This would not have weighed very much with them; we are therefore bound to look in another direction for this leniency. If Theodotion was a proselyte, this would explain admirably why he was allowed to go out scot free. He did not know that it was not permitted to offer the passah-lamb outside Jerusalem. It was an error of judgment committed from the purest of motives, hence his immunity. If besides we take into consideration that by the new translation of the Bible he may have rendered a signal service to the community, we easily understand why he has been treated with such regard.* He is not to be confounded with Theodoros the doctor who is a contemporary of R. Akiba;† this seems to have been a man from Alexandria. I make this remark because Levy in his Talmudic dictionary brings both under the same name Todos, and translates this latter as Theodoros, which is not correct.

There is one more reference to Todos in the old Hebrew literature which leads us straight to the question from which we started in our investigation, viz., the relation between this Todos and the additions to the canonical book of Daniel.

In the name of Todos we find in the late Midrash to the Psalms‡ a peculiar Aggadic interpretation of the martyrdom of the Three Children. "According to Todos the three children compared themselves with the frogs which, according to the word of Scripture, entered also the furnaces of the Egyptians at the bidding of God, (Exod. vii, 28), but they were not hurt, as God protected them: the more reason for them to hope, who had also the merits of their forefathers to assist them, and had moreover the duty to sanctify the Name of God, and to suffer martyrdom for His sake."

This line of argument harmonises very well with the character of Theodotion as we have tried to sketch it; he was a zealous and devout proselyte. That he should have just chosen the three children for the exponents of his views, corroborates the idea that

* Cf. also Jer. Betza, II, § 7, f. 61c; Toseftah Betza, II, § 15, p. 204, ed. Zuckerman.

† Tr. Berachoth, fol. 28b, and Toseftah Oholoth, IV, § 2, p. 600, ed. Zuckerman.

‡ Ps. xxviii, v. 2, p. 229, ed. Buber.

he must have occupied himself more specially with these incidents recorded in the book of Daniel. There is in the whole of Hebrew literature, as far as I am aware of, no other reference to a biblical passage recorded in his name.

If we return now to the starting point of this inquiry, we shall find that Jerahmeel has preserved also the date when Theodotion lived. He places him under Commodus, and is thus in perfect agreement with the tradition of Epiphanius, who places him exactly under the same reign. Nor is this date contradicted by the quotations and references in the Talmudic literature. According to all these independent witnesses, Theodotion flourished during the second half of the second century after the common era.

The remaining portion of Jerahmeel's introduction is no less interesting. We have there so faint an echo of Aristæus' famous letter that it is scarcely recognisable. According to Jerahmeel, the Greek translation of the LXX dates from the first half of the second century before Christ, as he lets the High Priest Eleazar, who takes part in it, die in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes (*circa*. 170 B.C.). This may mean to signify the latest date when all the books of the Bible were translated, as Jes. Sirach (130 B.C.) alludes to the existence of that translation, whether in whole or parts is not perfectly clear. The time of Antiochus may be the *terminus ad quem*.

As far as Akilas and Symmachus are concerned, the date assigned to them by Jerahmeel—the time of Hadrian—seems to be perfectly correct, although some would like to place Symmachus after Theodotion.

From the preliminary matter we pass now to the text itself. We first study the language in which it is written. It is a remarkable fact that it is more like unto the Aramaic of the Book of Daniel than to that of the Targumim. The only difficulty we have to contend with in this connection is that we have only one copy, no other MS. being known to exist; the writing of this MS. is also not perfectly clear throughout. But in spite of these drawbacks the character of the text stands out clear enough, and we find in it all the peculiarities of the Biblical Aramaic.* On the other hand, it is very remote from the Syriac form of the fragment of the legend of the Dragon mentioned above. The lexicon is somewhat richer, as new words are to be found which do not occur in the Biblical

* Cf. Driver, "Introduction to the Old Testament," 3rd ed., pp. 471-473.

texts, and these have the same archaic ring about them as the rest. Judging, therefore, only from the language, we would be justified in assigning a high antiquity to this Aramaic version of the Song of the Three Children, and of the legend of the Dragon, for both these have been preserved to us in the compilation of Jerahmeel.

If we proceed now to the comparison between the Aramaic text and the version of Theodotion, such as we can reconstruct it after the numberless interpolations, omissions and alterations it has been subjected to, we shall find an *absolute identity* extending to the most *minute details*. All those points brought out by Fritzsche in his exhaustive study of the Song of the Three Children—to commence with this—find their ample justification in our Aramaic text. All the changes introduced by Theodotion correspond with the Aramaic text; all those passages proved to be later interpolations are missing from the Aramaic; the inversion of order to be observed, especially in the actual song in the Greek of Theodotion, has its counterpart in our Aramaic, and many a hazarded suggestion advanced by one or the other commentator—who sought to find in an Aramaic original the source and reason of misunderstandings—will be corroborated by our text. The confusion in the order of things enumerated in verses 28–50, varying in various MSS. and translations, disappears completely when compared with the order in the Aramaic text. Here we have, first God, then the heavenly bodies, then follow all the phenomena of the air, such as rain, dew, snow, frost, clouds, and so on; then land, sea and birds; lastly man. The minute commentary, which follows later on, is intended to bring out all these points. From such a minute study it will become evident beyond doubt or cavil, that we have in this Aramaic text the long-sought for, often denied, and now proved Semitic original of Theodotion's translation. I publish it (in Part II) exactly after the original MS., adding my corrections in brackets, and I subjoin to it an English translation, the differences between this and the current one* are as much marked as they are when comparing the Aramaic text with the Greek texts of Theodotion and the LXX. In the commentary I will point out the more important passages which seem to be conclusive.

I pass now to the other portion containing the legend of the Dragon. As has already been remarked, this legend was found long

* Published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; London, 1881.

ago in an ancient Midrash, but this differs so much from the Greek versions that it could not be the probable original of these latter. Not so, however, is the case with Jerahmeel's text, which follows immediately upon the Song. This corresponds exactly to the true text of Theodotion, and this absolute identity helps us to restore that very text, which as appears now, has been a little curtailed and made to fit better with that of the LXX. Here and there a few words are omitted in the Greek, and in one verse a very important detail is not to be found in the latter, which however must have been in the original, as we find it also in the parallel in Josippon. Both these texts contain a more detailed description of the ingredients which Daniel put into the lump of food for the dragon. Pitch, fat and hair alone would not kill a dragon such as that worshipped by the Babylonians, accustomed as it must have been according to legend to devour whole animals. In both texts Daniel used these merely as blinds, as "he rolled them round iron hatchets and made one big lump of it, which he threw into the mouth of the dragon. When the dragon had swallowed it, the fat and pitch melted away in the stomach, and the sharp points of the iron hatchets caused the dragon to linger and die." It is not likely that this should be a later interpolation, as we find it in two independent texts, also in the Midrash Rabba on Genesis lxviii, f. 77 c, d (ed. Fcft) ad Genes. xxviii, 12. I cannot find a satisfactory reason for the omission, unless in the desire of reducing the divinity of that dragon to a still smaller scale. The LXX have felt the incongruity between the things used by Daniel in the making up of that lump, and have added therefore that "the weight of the pitch used was very great, no less than 30 manehs," the cause of death was thus this great quantity.

With the assistance of the Aramaic version we shall get rid also of the remarkable bowl with bread, which reminds one of the Buddhist monks with their begging bowl. In the Aramaic, the prophet puts his bread in his *sac*, which he carries probably on his back, as he perforce must keep in his hands the pottage sod by him for the reapers. One can easily increase the number of such instances where our text gives a proper meaning, and shows its incontestable superiority over all the other versions, the Greek included. The language is the same as that of the other piece, the same grammatical forms and the same general character, distinct from Syriac and not absolutely identical with the Targumim.

In order to obviate a possible objection, viz., that Jerahmeel may have got hold of another version of Josippon and have transferred these two texts from it into his Chronicle, especially as the copyist added here a note, included by me in brackets, to the effect that "from here on Jerahmeel copied from Todos and the Jewish Josippon," it is necessary to point out that these very texts are to be found also in his extracts from Josippon, totally different from the Aramaic text, and corresponding entirely with the printed editions of that book. This alone suffices to prove the accuracy and faithfulness of Jerahmeel, who repeated the same texts twice, copying them from *two different* sources. It gives further credibility to the authorship of these Aramaic portions in his Chronicle, a credibility which they fully deserve, as it is borne out by the comparison between them and the Greek translation of Theodotion.

II.—TEXT.

ועתה אעתיק חסרון ההודאות והשירים. אשר היללו
ושבחו שלשת הבחורים שמצא תודוס שאינו בכד ספרים:
ודין הוא סידרא דיסדר בסידריה תודוס גבר חכים די פתר
ביומוהי דקומודוס מלכא דרומאי דהא לא אישתבח
בספרא דעבראי אילהין מן שבעים סבייא די פתרו סיפרא
דאורייתא עם אלעזר כהנא רבא דאיתקטיל ביומוהי
דאנטיוכוס שחיק טמייא די פתרו כל אורייתא ביומוהי
דתלמי מלכא דמצראי ואף גובריא אילין תרין די
שמהתהון סימכוס ועקילס די פתרו ביומוהי דאדריינוס מלכא
הוו מן פותרנייא ואקילס הוא אונקלוס: ודין הוא סידרא
די לא כתיבא בסידרא דעיבראי דהא תודוס אשכחא:
1 ואולו תלתיהון לגו. אתון נורא יקדתא משבחין ומברכין
ית יי וקם עזריה לצלאה וצלי כדון ופתח פומיה ואמר:
2 בריך הוא אלהא דאבהתנא ויהא שמיה משבח ומהדר
3 לעלמי: דהא קשוט את בכל מה דעבדת לנא דכל

עובדך קשיטין ואורחתך יציבין וכל דיינך מהימנין:
 4 ארי דין דקשוט עבדתא על כל די אייתיתת עלנא ועל
 קרתא ירושלם קדישתא די לאבהתנא דהא דינין קשיטין
 5 אייתיתת עלנא בדיל חובנא: חבנא ועוינא ואעדנא
 6 מינך. ושטנא מכל פקודייה די פקודתא לנא דלא קבילנא
 7 יתהון למיטר ולמיעבד בדיל דאוטיב לנא: ובדיל די
 8 לא עבדנא פיקודייד וקיימך עבדת דין דקשוט: די מסרתא
 יתנא בידא דסנאין בישיין ובידא דמלכין חייבין ובישיין
 9 בכל ארעתא: וכען לית אנן יכילנא למיפתח פומנא
 10 דהא לחיסודא הוו עבדך די דבקין בך: ובבעו מנך די
 לא תימסר יתנא לחלוטין בדיל שמך רבא וקדישא ולא
 11 תשכח שהידוותך: ולא תעדי טיבותך מיננא בדיל אברהם
 12 רחיימך ויצחק עבדך וישראל קדישך: די אמרת להון
 לאסגאה ית בניהון ככוכבי שמיא וכחלא דעל כיף ימא:
 13 ועד כאן עזרנא (וערנה. 1) יי מן כל עממיא דמסכינין אנחנא
 14 בכל ארעתא יומא דין בדיל חובנא: ובעידנא הדין לית
 לן לא רב ונבייא ולא פחוותא וסיגנין ולא עלוון וניכסין
 ומנחתא דלית אתר לאיתאה כל אילין קדמך לאשכחא
 15 רחמין: אילהין בנפשא נכאה ורוחה תבירא נתקבל
 16 כעלוון וניכסין דיכרין ותורין וכאלפין אימרין פטימין: כדון
 יהא דיבחא דילנא יומא דין לרעוא מן קדמך דהא לא
 17 יתכלמון כל די מהודין לך: וכען בעין אנא בכל ליבנא
 18 למדחל יתך: ונתבע מן קדמך די לא תתכלים יתנא
 19 אילהין תעביד עימנא כרחמנותך ובסגי טיבותך: שזיב
 יתנא והב יקרא לשמך יי ותיתכלם לכל דעבדין לעבדייא

20 דילך בישא: ויהון מתכלמין מכל גבורתהון ומתוקפהון
 21 יהון תבירין. וידעין ארי את בלחודך שליט בכל ארעתא:
 22 כען נסיבו עבדין דמלכא ושמשוהי די רמיו לתלתא
 גוברין באתונא נפשא וזיפתא ונעורת ועבדו גלילין.
 23 לאסגאה שלהובית דנור מעילוי אתונא ברום ארבעין
 24 ותשע אמין: ונפק נורא ושללהוביתא ואוקיד יתהון עם
 25 כל מאן די הוו קיימין מכשדאי בסטר אתונא: ומלאכא
 דיי נחית עם עזריה וחברוהי באתונא ואיצטגין נורא
 26 דאתונא: ועבד בגו אתונא כרוחא די מנשבא שלא ולא
 27 קריב בהון כל נור ולא איתנוזיקו מידעם: בכן איליין
 תלתיהון בפומא חדא שבחו והודו ובריכו ית יי בגו
 28 אתונא יקדתא ואמרו: בריך יי אלהא דאבהתנא ויהא
 29 משבח ומרומס לעלמי עלמיא: וברוך יהא שמך רבא
 30 ויקירא וקדישא ומשבח ומרומס על כל עלמא: בריך
 את בהיכלא קדישתך ותשתבח ותתיקר על כל עלמין:
 31 בריך את בכורסא יקר מלכותך ותשתבח ותתרומס לעלם
 32 ולעלמי עלמיא: בריך את דאישתקעתא תהומיא וייתבתא
 33 על כרובין ותהי משבח ומהדר בכל עלמין: בריך את
 34 ברקיע שמיא ותתהלל ות(ש)תבח בעלמין: בריכו כל
 עובדיא יי אלהין שבחוניה ורוממוהו יתיה בעלמא.
 35 בריכו מאלכיא יי אלהין הללוהו ורוממוהו בעלמא:
 36 בריכו מיא די מעילוי שמיא אלהין הללוהו ורוממוהו
 37 בעלמא: בריכו כל חיליאי דיי אלהין חללוהו ורוממוהו
 38 בעלמא: בריכו כוכבי שמיא אלהין הללוהו ורוממוהו

בעלמא: בריכו מיטרא וטלא אלהין הללוהו ורוממוהו 39
 בעלמא: בריכו כל רוחיא דיי אלהין שבחוהו ורוממוהו 40
 בעלמא: בריכו אשא¹ ושרבא אלהין בריכו קריר וחמימא 41
 אלהין הללו ורומ' בעלמ': בריכו רעפיא וגירא אלהין 42
 בריכו קרח וקברא אלהין הללו ורומ' בעלמ': בריכו 43
 קיטורין ועננין אלהין ברי' לילון ויממין אלהין הל' ורו'
 בעל': בריכו נהורא וחשוכא אלהין ברי' קבלא ועמיטתא 44
 אלהין הללו ורו' בעלמ': ברי' ארעתא אלהין 45
 בריכו טוריא ורמתא אלהין הללו ורומ' בעלמ': ברי' כל 46
 צימחי ארעא אלהין בריכו מבועיא אלהין הללו ורומ'
 בעלמ': בריכו ימייא ונהריא אלהין ברי' נוניא וכל די 47
 רחיש במיא אלהין הללו ורומ' בעלמ': ברי' כל ציפרי 48
 שמיא אלהין בריכו כל חיותא ובעירא אלהין הללו
 ורומ' בעלמ': ברי' כל בני אינשא אלהין בריך ישר' 49
 אלהין הללו ורומ' בעלמ': ברי' כהניא דיי אלהין הללו 50
 ורומ' בעלמ': ברי' רוחין ונשמי צדיקיא אלהין בריכו 51
 קדישין וענוי לבב אלהין הללו ורו' בעלמ': בריכו חנניה 52
 עזריא ומישאל אלהין הללו ורוממו' בעלמא דהא שויבנא
 משאול ופריק יתנא מידא דמותא דהא שויבנא מן אתון
 נורא יקידתא ומנור דליק ושלחובין יציל יתנא: הודון 53
 קדם יי ארי טב דהא לעלמיא טיבותיא ובריכו למרי
 עלמא הוא אלהין הללוהו ורוממוהו בעלמא: עד כה
 סופא דמלתא. די לא כת'בתא בספר יהודייתא: [מכאן
 ואילך העתיק ירחמאל מתודוס ויוסיפון בישראל:]

¹ אשתא, probably אתשא.

1 והא באתרא ההוא תנין רב וסגיא דהוו פלחין ליה
 2 כל בני בבל: ואמר מלכא לדניאל הא כען לא תיכול
 למימר דהאדין לית אלהא חייא הוא וכען צלי כען
 3 קדמוהי: ואשיב דניאל למלכא ואמר מן קדם יי אלהא
 4 דאבהתי אנא מצלי דהא אלהא חייא רבא ודחילו: ואם
 את מלכא תתיהב לי רשותא איקטל ית תנינא הדין
 5 בלא חרבא וחניתא: ואמר מלכא לדניאל הא כען אנא
 6 יהיב לך רשותא למיעבד ליה כל רעותך: ואזל דניאל
 ונסיב ליה זפתא ושמוניתא וכיתן ושערין ויגלול יתהון
 לגליל חד ועבד ליה מסריקא דברזלא ויגלול ית כל דין
 7 סחור סחור למסריקא ורמחי בפומי דתנינא: והוה כד
 בלע יתיה תנינא ונחית בגופיה ופשר שמוניתא וזפתא
 מעילוי מסריקא וחביל תנינא משיני מסריקא וימות ואמר
 8 דניאל הא כען אלהכון דהויתון פלחין קדמוהי: והוה
 כד שמעו בני בבל דהא מית תנינא ותקף להון לחדא
 וכנשו ועלו קדם מלכא ואמרו למימר הא כען אנחנו
 ידעין דאת הוא כחדא מן גברין יהודאין דהא בל חבילתא
 ואף ית תנינא קטלתא וכהני בל עם היכליה תברתא:
 9 וכען אם לא תימסר ית דניאל בידנא ניקטול יתך
 10 בביתך: וחזא מלכא דהא תקף להון לחדא דבעו
 11 למקטליה ומסר להון ית דניאל: ושויאו ית דניאל בגו
 12 בירא דאריוותא והוה תמן שבעה יומין: ארי בירא הוה
 באתרא ההוא די ביה שבעא אריוון והוו יהבין ליה כל
 יומא תרין פגרי אינשין ותרין אען וההוא יומא לא
 13 איתיהיבו להון בדיל די יכלון ית דניאל: והוה חבקוק
 בייא בארעא דישר' והוה מבשל תבשילא למיכל

לחצדייא ושוי לחמא בשקיה ואול למייתי לחצדייא
 בחקלא: והא מלאכא דיי ואמר לחבקוק נבייא למימר ויל¹⁴
 ואייתי כען ית תבשילא הדין דבשילתא בבבל קרתא
 והב ליה לדניאל דהוא בגוב אריוותא: ועני חבקוק¹⁵
 ואמר למלאכא ריבוני הא לא חזיתי בבל קרתא מדאייתי
 ואף גוף [גוב 1.] אריוותא לא ידעית: ונסיב מלאכא דיי¹⁶
 בקדליה ונטליה בצוציתא דרישיה ושוי יתיה עם מיכלא
 די בידיה על פוס גוב אריוותא די בבבל: והוה כד תב¹⁷
 רוחיה לוותיה וקרא חבקוק לדניאל ואמר טול כען מזונא
 הדין די שדר לך אלהך: ושבח וצלי דניאל ואמר יי¹⁸
 אלהין דאת דכיר יתי די לא שבקתא כל דרחימין לך:
 וקם דניאל ואכל ומלאכא דיי אתיב ית חבקוק לאתריה¹⁹
 בשעתא חדא: והוה ביומא שביעאה וקם מלכא ואול²⁰
 לגוב אריוותא למיחזי ית דניאל וחזא ית דניאל יתיב
 בגובא: וקרא מלכא בקול רם וסגיא ואמר יי אלהיה²¹
 דדניאל רבה הוא ויקרא: ופקיד מלכא לאסקא לדניאל²²
 מן גוב אריוותא ואינן גוברין די אכלו קורציה דדניאל
 אמר מלכא למירמי תמן ורמו יתהון בגוב אריוותא ואכלו
 יתהון בפריע:

III.—COMMENTARY.

I pass now to the detailed and minute comparison between the Aramaic text published here for the first time, and the two Greek translations, the LXX and Theodotion. This comparison will show how far the contention is justified by facts that the Aramaic text is the very original of those translations, especially of Theodotion's, and is not a translation from any of the Greek texts, or any other

text in existence. I have used O. F. Fritzsche's edition,* which so far seems to be the best available.

At the same time I will offer some emendations of the Aramaic text, and some observations on the state of its preservation.

A. *The Song.*

V. 1. Is almost identical with Theodotion, and just as short; differing from LXX. Instead of *φλογος* we have however **אתון נורא יקדתא**, "The furnace of burning fire," corresponding to the second half of the LXX, *τῷ πυρὶ ὑποκατοιμένης τῆς καμίνου*. *Azarias* is the *only* one who prays, not *all* as in the LXX.

V. 2. **ברוך** corresponds exactly to *εὐλογητός*; **משבח** settles the reading *αἰνετόν*, and refers to the name of God. The verb is in the third instead of the second person, in conformity with the old Hebrew forms of praise, **לעולם אמן אמן** Ps. lxxxix, 53, and more especially Ezra vii, 27, with which the first half of v. 2 is identical.

V. 3. For the first *ἀληθινὰ* stands here **קשוט**, whilst for the second, which in some MSS. alternates with *ἀλήθεια*, we have the word **מדיבנין**, identical with Syr. P. This is a proof for the original character of the Aramaic, where two distinct words are used instead of one and the same, as is the case in the Greek. We shall find later on similar examples of copiousness of language in Aramaic for various shades of identical notions, which are rendered however by one and the same Greek word. The two words **יציב** and **מדיבנין** are used together (Daniel ii, 45), and **אמת ויציב** is the form used in the morning prayer of the Jewish Liturgy, which dates from the times of the second Temple.

V. 4. Our text has the singular, **דין דקשוט**, "true judgment," corresponding to v. 7, *ἐν ἀληθινῇ κρίσει*, where the same words occur.

אייתיתא, twice so in the MS., must be altered into **אייתיתא**. the *scriptio plena*, which we find in most cases of 2 s. in our text. It corresponds to Theodotion *ἐπιγγαγες* in both instances in this verse.

* Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Graece. Lipsiae, 1871.

σοῦ of the LXX is omitted by Theodotion and in our text. *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ κρίσει* is not a very happy juxtaposition, it is contrary to the constant combination of 'truth' with 'judgment.' In our text we have the correct form *in true judgment*, or *judgment of truth*, once before in the same verse, and in v. 7. Cf. also Nehem. ix, 33.

V. 5. *ἐν πᾶσι* of the LXX, neither Theodotion nor our text. *ἀποστῆναι* is as near a translation as can be found of *וּמֵעַדְנָא*, the Aphel-form of *עָדָה*, to depart, to remove oneself from. It stands in the finite form, and is parallel with the two preceding verbs and the following *וּשְׁטָנָא*; so also Syriac, ed. Lagarde.

V. 6. The Greek translator has read *בבֵּל* as it is in the Syriac (ed. Lagarde) instead of *מִבֵּל*, hence the peculiar *ἐν πᾶσι*, which gives no satisfactory meaning. It ought to read *ἐν πᾶσι ταῖς ἐντολαῖς*, according to the Aramaic text. The whole text of the two verses (7 and 8) does not seem to have been well preserved in Greek. V. 7 looks like an unnecessary repetition of v. 4. In the Aramaic we have in v. 8 the justification for the true punishments, and the way how they have been carried out. The LXX reading of v. 7 seems to be the more accurate.

V. 8. *ἐχθίστων ἀποστατῶν* is omitted in the Aramaic text, which does not know of apostates, and which has, *wicked and bad kings*, *מַלְכֵי מַלְכֵי pluralis*, instead of the singular of the Greek, which may have been interpolated into the Greek by a copyist who thought probably of Antiochus, "the wicked king." The difficulty felt of old about the "apostates" is thus solved, and the speculation about the wicked king falls to the ground. (Cf. Fritzsche, *l.c.*, p. 125.)

V. 9. The wording of the Aramaic favours Theodotion's Greek form *ἐγενήθη* against the senseless *ἐγενήθημεν*; the construction is however somewhat different in both versions. The Aramaic text agrees with Daniel ix, 16; cf. Joel ii, 17; the Greek translator must have thought of Isaiah xxx, 5, as he has *αἰσχύνῃ καὶ ὀνειδος* as in Isaiah, instead of only *αἰσχύνῃ* as in the Aramaic text.

V. 10. The Aramaic text has, "thy great and holy" added to "name," which is missing in Theodotion and LXX. *שְׁהִדּוּתךָ* corresponds to Hebrew *עֲדוּתךָ*, "Thy law, covenant." *תִּשְׁכַּח*, wrongly translated *διασκεδάσῃς*. The idea of God forgetting the Covenant is taken from Deut. iv, 31.

V. 11. Abraham, "thy beloved," *ἡγαπημένος*, is not a very correct

translation of רַחִימִךְ, which ought to be rendered by, φίλος σου, the usual title of Abraham. (Cf. Isaiah xli, 8.) The Semitic original for this translation has been suggested also by De Wette (*l.c.*, p. 509); Syriac has also רַחִימִךְ.

V. 13. Instead of the word עֲזֻרָנָא, which does not exist in Aramaic, we ought to read זַעֲרָנָא, "we have been diminished," "we have become less," ἐσμικρύνθημεν.

ὅτι is impossible, it must be καὶ νῦν, וְעַד כֵּאן, "and now."

ἐσμεν ταπεινοὶ is the inexact rendering of דַּמְסַכְיִין אֲנַחְנָא, "miserable," "poor," and helps us to recognize the Semitic original.

V. 14. In the Aramaic is no trace of a *king*, as Fritzsche and others suggest. רַב = ἄρχων, is the "leader" of the people; פַּהוּתָא וּסְגָנִין (copied from Daniel iii, 2, 3) are the "governors" and "deputies." In the Greek the last word is missing; the Syriac has, like our text, four offices, but in a different order: head and governor; prophet and leader.

"Incense" missing in Aramaic.

V. 15. Is based upon and modelled after Ps. li, 19. Fritzsche is perfectly right in omitting the interpunction before ὧς, which belongs to the preceding. The division of the verses is undoubtedly wrong in the Greek text, as is evidenced by the Aramaic. Here v. 16 commences with כְּדֹן, οὕτως.

V. 16. Is hopelessly corrupt in the Greek, as pointed out by Fritzsche; καὶ ἐκτελέσαι ὁπισθεν σου is omitted by the Syriac. It may have been a marginal variant which has crept into the text. The Vulgata alone has preserved the old true reading, "ut placeat tibi," corresponding to לָרְעוּא. Ethiopic has: "and let it (our sacrifice) be perfect with thee."

ἐσται, Theodotion for ἐστιν, LXX, is justified by the Itpael form יִתְכַּלְמֹן.

V. 17. בעֵין, "we pray," "we are desirous," has been evidently misunderstood by the translator as meaning 'quærere' (cf. Dan. ii, 13, 20), hence, "we follow thee" or, "seek after thee;" but in the Greek, the first καὶ is to be omitted, and the tense of the verb changed to the Infinitive. Ζητοῦμεν τὸ πρόσωπόν σου is likewise not a correct translation of the Aramaic וְנִתְבַּע מִן קִדְמָךְ, which means, "and we beseech thee." מִן קִדְמָךְ has been taken to have the meaning of Hebrew מִפְּנֵיךְ, and was translated accordingly. The verse does not finish here as now in the Greek, but is continued

further, being connected with the following through די, "that thou puttest us not to shame," which gives an excellent reading.

In the same way is v. 18 to be connected with v. 19, καὶ being left out and ἐξελδὺ ὑμᾶς connected with σοῦ. Instead of בסג, one could read also בסג. κατὰ τὰ θαυμάσια is identical with Jerem. xxi, 2, נפלאותיו, but whether it stood in the original is doubtful. In the Aramaic it is missing; it may have dropped out.

V. 21. בלחוד, which means "alone," has been incorrectly translated Θεὸς μόνος, as if it stood אל חד, and the whole sentence has got a dogmatic meaning alien to the Aramaic text. But no stress is laid on the *Oneness* of God, only on His *omnipotence*, just as in 1 Chron. xxix, 12, viz., that God is "the ruler over the whole world"; ἐνδοξος for שליט, rather freely.

V. 22 agrees more with Theodotion. οὐ διέλιπον has no counterpart in the Aramaic, unless it is added by Theodotion to make the statement more emphatic, or עבדין has been taken as a participle and constructed with נסיבו, as meaning, "and they commenced, or continued, to do." I am the more inclined to believe in such a misunderstanding, as the latter word is not translated at all. The ὑπηρεταί are the שמשוהי, the word דמלכא seems to have followed it, instead of preceding it as in the Aramaic. Theodotion must have read בען נסיבו עבדין שמשוהי דמלכא, etc. גלילין occurs for a second time in the following Dragon legend, v. 6, where we have the verb ויגלל, to *roll*. I translate it therefore, "and they made *balls* of naphtha, pitch, and tow." Theodotion took it to be the plural of גילא or גלא, hence κληματίδα, (*cf.* Levy, Targum-Wörterbuch, I, p. 139, s.v. גילא).

V. 23. Commences then naturally with לאסגאה, "to increase." If we had here לאסקא, which means, "to light, to incense," and also "to ascend," then Theodotion must have mistaken the meaning and translated, "to ascend," "to stream out." In consequence thereof Theodotion omits נורא ושלחוביתא in v. 24, as an unnecessary repetition. The Aramaic text, however, is quite correct, as in v. 23 the intention of increasing the fire and flame is mentioned, and in v. 24 quite a new thing happened, those very flames "streamed out and burned them" (*i.e.*, servants of the king), "and all those Chaldeans that stood about the furnace." In the Greek ἰתῆον is

omitted, undoubtedly by mistake, the "servants" were probably understood to be included among "the Chaldæans."

V. 25. The Aramaic **ואיצטנין**, which means, "and it cooled down," is rendered by the senseless, *ἐξετίναξε* "to smite out, to throw out" the fire from the oven. A misunderstanding of the original Semitic word, which becomes still more evident in the curious translation of v. 26, **ברוחא די מנשבא טלא**, which means, *as a wind that blows (and causes) the dew (to descend)*. This is very much alike to the formula inserted in the Eighteen blessings of the Morning prayer, dating from the time of the second Temple, where it alternates with the other formula, "Thou makest the wind to blow and causest the rain to descend." Both are based upon Ps. cxlvii, 18, "He causeth his wind to blow and waters flow." (Cf. Treatise Taanith, fol. 2A, first Mishna.) The Greek misunderstood **מנשבא**, and translated, *δυσσπριζον*, whistling. May be that he knew only the other Aramaic form **נתב** as meaning to blow, and hence his misunderstanding of **נשב**.

This passage has also been pointed out by De Wette as proving a Semitic original; v. 27 will therefore have to be translated, "and he made in the midst of the furnace like unto a wind that blew down dew," etc. The Syriac has, "the angel of dew went down."

Theodotion, *τὸ καθόλου* = **כל**. *παρηνώχλησεν* is rather inappropriate after *ἐλύπησεν* (cf. Daniel iii, 27), and is probably due to a misunderstanding of **מידעם**, a word, by the way, that does not occur in biblical Aramaic.

V. 27. **אתונה יקדתא** is omitted in the Greek; the Syriac has **אתונה דנורא**.

Vv. 28-65 of the Greek finish regularly with *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, or *εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, as if it stood in the original always **לעלמי עלמא**, in *sæcula sæculorum*, or **לעלמין**. This is not appropriate, however, in all cases, and is due, in every probability, to a confusion of **לעלמי** with **לעלמא**, the former meaning "in the world," or "all over the world," and "not for ever." In our Aramaic text we find indeed both forms used with the necessary discrimination between the two. God's Name is to be praised for ever; His creatures cannot very well praise Him for ever, as they themselves are transitory, but they can praise Him in this world and above everything. The former is therefore used more in vv. 27-34, the latter in all the subsequent verses, where the creatures are appealed to to raise

their voices in praise of God. Syriac has throughout לעלם like the Greek.

V. 28, absolutely identical with Theodotion, who has not *παντας*, as in v. 29, corresponding with the Aramaic כל; also only in v. 29. τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης is an incorrect translation of the Aramaic שמך ויקרא (רבא), "Thy great and glorious Name," רבא is omitted by Theodotion.

V. 30. In Aramaic there is nothing for the Greek τῆς δόξης σου, which proved a stumbling block from very ancient times (*cf.* Fritzsche, *l.c.*, p. 128). May be that ויקרא, from v. 29, or יקר, v. 31, was added afterwards, in order to make the first half of the verse correspond with those two verses. It is thus a later interpolation.

The Ithpaal forms of תשתבח and תתיקר explain the ἀπαξ-λεγομεν: ὑπερυμνητὸς καὶ ὑπερένδοξος, as the Greek translator felt forced to translate those emphatic forms here and in v. 32. For יקר and its derivation, δοξα is always used. I add here a list of the translations of vv. 28–33, which will show the relation between the original and the Greek.

משבח, v. 28, αἰνετὸς; v. 29, ὑπεραινετὸς; v. 32, ὑπερυμνητὸς; תשתבח, v. 30, ὑπερυμνητὸς; v. 31, αἰνετὸς; v. 33, ὑμνητὸς. (Theodotion read thus, משבח in vv. 28, 31 and 33, and תשתבח, vv. 29, 30, 32.)

מרום, vv. 28 and 29, and תתרום, v. 31, are all translated ὑπερυψούμενος; תתיקר, v. 30, ὑπερένδοξος; מוהר, v. 32, ὑπερυμνούμενος, and תתהלל, v. 33, δεδοξασμένος.

The Aramaic is more varied in expressions and more original in its forms, whilst the Greek is forced, and clearly an imitation of the Aramaic.

Vv. 31 and 32. Theodotion now reversed (*cf.* Fritzsche, *l.c.*) probably later alteration. V. 31. δόξης after θρονου in some codices of Theodotion is justified by יקר. The expression is borrowed from הדר מלכותו, Ps. cxlv, 12, "His glorious kingdom."

V. 32. דאשתקעתא, "who hast lowered the abyss," or "causest the depths (abyss) to sink down," *i.e.*, "established them down below," is mistranslated, ἐπιβλέπων. Theodotion must have read the word differently, probably some form derived from שקף: "to look," דאשקפתא? (*cf.* Deut. xxvi, 15; Ps. xiv, 2; Lament. iii, 50, etc.) The whole Song is modelled evidently after Ps. cxlviii.

The same order is followed in both, only the subjects are more numerous in the Song.

V. 33. Like Theodotion, שמיא, "of the heavens," after στερεώμα, רקיע.

V. 35 of the Greek, which is only a repetition of v. 33, is missing in the Aramaic (*cf.* Ps. cxlv, 4).

V. 35 Aramaic = 36 Greek.

V. 36 Aramaic = 37 Greek. καὶ πάντα, which is out of place, is omitted in the Aramaic. καὶ has been omitted also by Theodotion (v. Fritzsche, *l.c.*), *cf.* Ps. cxlv, 4.

V. 37. היליאי, exactly the δυνάμεις of Theodotion = צבאיו, Ps. cxlv, 2.

V. 39 of the Greek is missing in the Aramaic. In Syriac B it is marked with an asterisk, as being a later interpolation (*cf.* Fritzsche, *l.c.*, p. 129).

V. 38 = Greek 40. שמיאי, plural, whilst Greek τοῦ ὕπανοῦ.

V. 39. (Greek 41.) πᾶς, probably taken from the following verse, as it is here quite out of place. Omitted in the Aramaic.

V. 40. (Greek 42.) πνεύματα, an inexact translation of רוחיא, instead of the proper, ἄνεμοι. One proof more for the Semitic of being the original, and the Greek a translation (*cf.* De Wette, *l.c.*).

V. 41-44. (44 Greek.) The MSS. of Theodotion's version differ very much among themselves about the text and the order of these verses, which is far from being settled. Our Aramaic text is of extreme value for the reconstruction of the original text, and proves its absolute independence from the Greek.

Each verse in the Aramaic stands for two of the Greek. I divide them into *a* and *b*, the first and second half, for easier comparison, and I add also the numbers of LXX.

V. 41a = 43 Theodotion and 43 LXX, *fire and heat*. 41b, *cold and warm*, corresponds exactly with Theodotion 48, ψῦχος καὶ καῶμα, although he uses καῶμα also, v. 21, whilst the Aramaic has חמימא in the second instance. The LXX has, v. 44 (ed. Fritzsche, p. 76), ῥίγος καὶ ψῦχος, and the same idea of ice and cold and snow and frost is repeated at least four times (vv. 44-47) without any apparent reason, unless it is due to inaccurate translation. Vv. 45 and 47 of the LXX are omitted entirely by Theodotion, probably as unnecessary repetitions, and the position of the others is changed.

V. 42a. רעפיא must be read רעמיא, "thunders and lightnings" (literally, "arrows"); *cf.* the first half of Theodotion and

LXX, 50, ἀστραπαί. The "thunder" is left out. 42*b*. קברא must be read קורא; the words קרח and קורא are taken from Ps. cxlvii, 17, where they occur together, *ice and cold*, Theodotion, v. 49, πάχναι καὶ χιόνες. In the LXX we have the choice of vv. 46 or 47, 46 being a more accurate translation of קרח and קורא, πάγος καὶ ψύχος.

V. 43*a*. *Vapours and clouds* (Ps. cxlviii, 8), Theodotion 50, has only νεφέλαι. whilst the LXX has, v. 45, δρόσοι καὶ νιφετοί, which latter word could be a corruption from δ. κ. νεφέλαι. The alterations into νιφετοί may have suggested itself through v. 50, where νεφέλαι is, however, not in its proper place, at least according to the Aramaic text. 43*b*, *nights and days*, Theodotion, 46; LXX, 48.

V. 44*a*. *Light and darkness*, Theodotion, 47; LXX, 49. 44*b*, קיבלא ועמיטתא, "blackness and gloom," or, as I would prefer to translate, "dusk and dawn." These two are omitted in both Greek translations.

The text has now a more systematic and harmonious appearance: first heat and cold in the abstract, then thunder and lightning, then ice, frost and snow, then vapours and clouds, then day and night. All these are phenomena that happen in the air, the earth and its elements follow naturally upon it.

V. 45*a* = Greek 51. Aramaic, the *lands*, plural; Theodotion, γῆ. 45*b* (Greek 52), mountains and hills.

46*a* = Greek 53. 46*b* has only מבויעיא, these are "the fountains of the deep" (*cf.* Genesis vii, 11), and must therefore be mentioned before "the seas and rivers." The transposition in the Greek text is therefore not likely to be due to Theodotion, who moreover agrees with the Aramaic in omitting ὄμβρος (so the LXX), mentioned already before, in v. 41. Similarly we must alter θάλασσα, v. 55, Greek, into θαλάσσαι = ימיוא of the Aramaic.

Instead of כנייא, Theodotion must have read תניניא, hence κήτη instead of the simple *fish*.

V. 48*a*. (Greek 57.) τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is as literal a translation of the Semitic ציפרי שמיא as can be wished. Theodotion has πάντα = Aramaic כל in 57 and 58, in the latter only before θηρία, just as in the Aramaic.

חיותא means the wild, and בעירא the tame animals, and are faithfully rendered by θηρία καὶ τὰ κτήνη; *cf.* Ps. cxlviii, 10, החיה הכל בהמה, "beasts and all cattle."

V. 49. (Greek 59.) Theodotion, *οἱ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, without *οἱ* = Aramaic **בני אנושא** ; **כל** is omitted in the Greek.

V. 50. (Greek 61-62.) The second half of this verse seems to have dropped out in the Aramaic, as each verse has as a rule *two* distinct parallel subjects ; and here only priests are mentioned. Theodotion has *δουλοί* = **עבדי**, after *ιερεῖς*, **כהנייא**, and *κυρίου* after each, just as in the Aramaic **דיי**. We must therefore complete the Aramaic verse accordingly.

V. 51. (Greek) 63. **רוחין ונשמי צדיקיא** = *πνεύματα καὶ ψυχὰι δικαίων*. The wording leaves it undecided whether it is a question of the living or the dead (*cf.* Fritzsche, *l.c.*, p. 130). The following half of the verse mentions however the living, **ענוי לבב**, *ταπεινοὶ ὁγ καρδίᾳ*. The **קדישין**, *ὁσίοι*, must necessarily also be taken as living. (*Cf.* Daniel vii, 21, 22, 27), and we shall translate therefore : *the spirits and souls of the just*. The juxtaposition of **רוח** and **נשמה** occurs in Job xxxiv, 14. I cannot see here any idea of the trichotomy of man as suggested by Fritzsche.

V. 52. (Greek 65.) **שאול** is rendered *ἄδης*. Theodotion has *ἔσωσεν* before *ἐκ χειρὸς θανάτου*, as in the Aramaic **פריק** before **מידא**.

Theodotion *ἐκ μέσου καμίνου* = Aramaic **מן אתון**, "From the burning fire and flame He has saved us." Of these words, **דליק ושללהובן** are missing in both Greek translations, omitted probably because they appeared an unnecessary repetition of the foregoing verse. **יציל** is better rendered by *ἐλυτρώσατο*, LXX, than by *ἐρρύσατο*, with which Theodotion is credited ; as **שוב** is translated so in the same verse, and it is not likely that he should have repeated the same word when he had to translate another Aramaic word, **יציל**.

53. (66.) **הודין**, Greek *ἐξομολογήσθε* corresponds exactly.

53^b (67) differs completely from the Greek. The whole verse is not addressed to anyone. V. 52 concludes fitly with the three Children, all the others having been enumerated before. There was no room for *σεβόμενοι* to be repeated, as they were included among the *δουλοί*, etc. (vv. 50 ff. Aramaic, 61 ff. Greek). **למרי עלמא**, "The lord of the universe," must have been strangely misread by the LXX and Theodotion, as well as the following, **הוא אלהין**, "He is God." They have *τὸν Κύριον, τὸν Θεὸν τῶν Θεῶν*, "the Lord, the God

of gods." This verse is evidently modelled after Ps. cxxxvi, vv. 2 and 3, the Targum of which runs thus:—, . . . שבחו לאלהי אלהיא . . . שבחו למרי מריא. Theodotion or the LXX may have thought of these verses, and have changed the primitive form found in the Aramaic for the other more dogmatic, but alien to the text.

The result of this detailed comparison is, that the Aramaic is a more primitive and more correct text, agreeing in the main with Theodotion, but differing sufficiently from his text to show its independence from any of the existing forms of the Greek. It represents thus the oldest text of the Song, and helps us to reconstruct the primitive form of Theodotion's Greek translation as it must have been before it was altered and interpolated from the LXX.

By these means we shall be able to reconstruct also the original form of the version of the LXX, as this also must have suffered many alterations and interpolations from Theodotion and others. Those readings in Theodotion which differ from our text will have to be considered as originating from the LXX, and *vice versa* those agreeing more closely with our Aramaic text than the corresponding portion in Theodotion, have crept into the LXX from Theodotion.

We shall thus obtain a clearer insight into the true character of the old LXX version before Theodotion, and understand better the reason for its elimination from the church service; for it will be found to differ very materially from the Aramaic text, with which Theodotion would then exactly correspond. For this very reason the former had been eliminated, and the latter substituted instead, though it has become rather mixed in the course of time. It must be borne in mind that the Song formed, from very ancient times, part of the Church Hymn book, and is often found added to the Psalter. Hence the profound alterations to which it was subjected, and the amalgamation of LXX and Theodotion.

We are much better off in the other legend, where such causes did not operate to alter the character of the two translations; and I pass on to the examination of—

Daniel and the Dragon.

V. 1. (LXX 23; Theodotion 23.) The Aramaic text has באתרא ההוא, "in that place," in common with LXX, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τόπῳ, and רב וסגיא, "great and mighty," with Theodotion μέγας.

תנין is rendered by both *ἐράκων*.

כל, missing in the Greek.

V. 2. (24.) Aramaic totally different. No trace in it of "brass," which was suggested in the Greek by the tale of the brazen idol Bel (v. 7), nor of "eating and drinking." Instead of *προσκαυνησαν* we have צלי, "pray."

V. 3 is missing in LXX, but is v. 25 Theodotion, with which the Aramaic text agrees in general, but has more than the Greek למלכא, "to the king;" דאבהתי, "of my fathers;" and רב ודחיל, "mighty and awe-inspiring," which are all missing in the latter. *Syriac* identical with Theodotion.

V. 4. (LXX 25; Theodotion 26.) איקטל, identical with Theodotion, *ἀποκτενῶ*; and not LXX, *ἀνελῶ*. All the ancient versions have then, "a sword and staff," *μαχαίρας* (Theodotion), *σδεήρου* (LXX) *καὶ ῥάβδου* *Syriac* חורטא. Only the Aramaic has the proper word, חניתא, "lance," which must have been read חורטא from very ancient times. חרב וחנית is a standing phrase in the Bible, cf. I Samuel xiii, 19, 22; xvii, 45, 47; xxi, 9.

V. 5. The Aramaic text is again more complete. The permission asked for by Daniel is granted in express terms, אנה יהיב לך = Theodotion 26, *ἐἰδωμί σου*, and not LXX, *δέδοται σε*, and then follows "leave to do unto it all that thou wishest," which LXX and Theodotion omit.

Vv. 6 and 7. (LXX 26; Theodotion 27.) I have already drawn attention in the Introduction to the great difference between these and the corresponding Greek verses. Among the ingredients we have also גליל, "flax." *μῶζας*, Theodotion, is proved by גליל, "a round lump." The whole portion of the iron hatchets is missing in the Greek texts, and thus no satisfactory reason for the death of the dragon is given, at least by Theodotion. The LXX have the large mass of 30 manehs for the lumps made by Daniel. Theodotion, *τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν*, is identical with Aramaic, which he must have read אלהכון פלחון קרמוהי, omitting אלהכון, and took it to be the plural. Totally different is the ironical question of the LXX, *οὐ ταῦτα ἐέβεσθε*. *Syriac* differs from all.

V. 8. (27, Theodotion 28.) Almost identical with Theodotion, *ἡγανάκησαν λίαν* is an excellent translation of the idiomatic תקוף להן, which is repeated in v. 10 (Theodotion 30), and has the

meaning "to be mightily (incensed) against . . ." *cf.* Targum to Psalm xviii, 8, דתקוף ליה, etc. Much clearer is the sentence in the Aramaic, "for we know now that thou art like unto one of the Jewish men." Theodotion, Ἰουδαῖος γέγονεν ὁ βασιλεὺς; *cf.* Fritzsche (*l.c.* p. 152). Aramaic has, after *ιερεῖς*, "of Bel and his temple," and, instead of κατέσφαξε, תברתא, "thou hast broken up."

V. 9. (Theodotion 29.) Aramaic much shorter, a continuation of the words spoken by the people in v. 8, and not a new statement, as in Theodotion. בביתך, *in* thine house, Theodotion has read וביתך, *and* thine house.

V. 10. (Theodotion 30.) Here Theodotion has rendered תקוף דבעו למקטליה (see above v. 8), and instead of ἐπείγουσιν σφοδρὰ (*see above v. 8*), and instead of ἀναγκασθεῖς, "constrained," which is rather a mild description of the danger threatening him. Some other Aramaic word must have stood in the original used by Theodotion, or, what is more probable, with the change of a few letters he may have read the words as ובאולצניה (מסר), "and in his being constrained, delivered," etc.

V. 11. (31.) ושריאו, "they placed," I should like to read instead ושריאו, "they cast," as it corresponds exactly with Theodotion, ἐβαλον. Instead of αὐτὸν we have in the Aramaic "Daniel."

Aramaic שבעה, seven, Theodotion and LXX ἑξ, six days.

V. 12. (Theodotion 32.) Aramaic has the addition of באתרא, "in that place." The real meaning of σώματα, which could mean also "slaves," is proved by the Aramaic פגרי אינשין to be "human corpses."

V. 13. (Theodotion 33.) The Aramaic בארעא דישראל is much more correct than Theodotion, Ἰουδαίᾳ, as the prophet Habakkuk lived in Israel and not in Judæa. ἤψησεν ἔψημα is as literal a translation of מבשל תבשילא, "sod a pottage" as could be wished for. Instead of σκαφήν the Aramaic has שקיה, "his sack" or "knapsack." The Syriac has ערבא, a very scarce word, which is translated *dish*, and seems to be a *hapaxlegomenon*. I am inclined to amend the word into טורבא = Persian توبرد = knapsack, which would make it absolutely identical with the Aramaic.

In the Aramaic we have also an addition of למיכל לחצדייא, "to feed the reapers."

14. (34.) Aramaic has also some small additions: ודא, "and there was" (or "appeared"); in some codices ὁ is preceding ἀγγελος;

וּלְ is added to וְאִיִּיתִי in conformity with the spirit of the Aramaic, "go and bring." Instead of ἔχεις we have דְּבִשְׁלִיתָ, "which thou hast cooked." After בְּבֵל the word קִרְתָּא, "town," is added here and in v. 15. וְהָבָה לֵיהּ, "and gave it to him" (to Daniel), is also missing in the Greek.

V. 15. (35.) לְמִלְאֲכָא not in the Greek.

V. 16. (36.) Here a peculiar confusion has crept into the Greek. Theodotion does not seem to have understood properly the word קְדִלָּא, which he translated κορυφήν "the crown," whilst the true meaning of it is "neck." There is then no tautology with the following, "hair," or as the Aramaic has it, "lock of his head," צִיצִיתָא. Aramaic adds, "and he set him with the food that he had in his hands over the mouth of the lions' den which was in Babylon."

V. 17. (36, 37.) The Aramaic text helps us here also over one of the most perplexing passages of the Greek text, of which no one has hitherto been able to extract a proper sense. Cf. Fritzsche (*l.c.*, p. 153-4), who does not mend matters. The words כִּדְ תַב רִוְהִיָּה, must have been strangely misread, possibly as בִּרְתַח רִוְחִיָּה, "the vehemency," "fury," ῥοιζύς, and has been united with the preceding verses, thus producing a totally unintelligible sentence. The Aramaic on the contrary is perfectly clear, and shows unmistakably that it must have been the original. The meaning is, "And when his breath came back to him" (or "he recovered his breath") which he had lost through the quickness of the flight, "Habakkuk called Daniel and said." After ὁ Θεός Aramaic adds, "thine," אֱלֹהֶךָ.

V. 18. (38.) Aramaic begins with וְשָׁבַח וְצִלִּי, "and Daniel praised and prayed, and said," which is natural when beholding the unexpected divine help. Instead of καὶ we have דִּי, "for." For the rest this verse is identical with Theodotion.

V. 19. (39.) Theodotion, παραχρημα LXX (38) ἤν αὐτὸν ἡμέρα; Aramaic, בְּשַׁעְתָּא חֲדָא, "in one hour." Theodotion read probably דְּחָדָא, "in that very hour."

V. 20. (40.) Aramaic וְהִדְוָה, as in vv. 7, 8, 13, and 17. וְשָׁבַח וְאָמַר, also a peculiar Aramaic construction similar to וְצִלִּי וְקָרָא throughout the text. In the Aramaic there is no trace of πενθῶσαι. Did Theodotion read לְמִיבְנִי instead of לְמִידְחִי?

V. 21. (41.) Aramaic מלכא, so in LXX, missing in Theodotion; Aramaic רב וסניא (cf. v. 20). Greek only, "great" (or loud). Aramaic has the third person, "is the god of," אלהיה Greek, εἰ, "art thou." Aramaic ויקירא, "and glorious" (cf. Song of Three Children, v. 29). Theodotion (and LXX) have instead καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν σοῦ.

V. 22. (42.) Aramaic has ופקיד מלכא, "and the king gave orders." Theodotion omits these as well as the words מן גרב אריותא.

אכלו קורציה, idiomatic expression, which is paraphrased by αἰτίους τῆς ἀπολείας αὐτοῦ.

אמר מלכא, also missing in Theodotion and LXX.

בפריע, Theodotion, παραχρημα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ; probably he read בפניו. Syriac has even more, "before him and before Daniel."

This minute comparison between the Aramaic text and Theodotion proves beyond doubt that the former is absolutely independent of the Greek. Not a single trace can be detected of any Greek influence, either in language or in construction. Both are pure Aramaic, agreeing in every point with the known characteristics of that language. No translation could be as perfect, and no text that we have can be looked upon as a probable or even possible original. But everything points to the contrary conclusion—that this Aramaic text represents the original from which Theodotion made his translation. Numerous instances of misreadings and misinterpretations have been adduced in the course of our examination, which prove conclusively the dependence of the Greek text upon this very Aramaic text. The close resemblance between the Aramaic and Theodotion in the Tale of the Dragon is beyond dispute. In this piece we recognise, more clearly than in that of the Song, how thoroughly Theodotion differed from the LXX, and we find in the Aramaic text the reason for the profound changes introduced by him into his translation. He tried to approximate it as closely as possible to this original from which the LXX had deviated so much. With the assistance of the Aramaic text, we are now in a position to remove many of the mistakes that have crept in, and to reconstruct the same text of Theodotion.

Not having found a place in the Liturgy, this tale has suffered less from interpolations, and we have therefore two distinct Greek texts, and not a mixed text as in the case of the "Song." In the

Tale of the Dragon we are therefore also in a better position to see how closely Theodotion follows the Aramaic text.

Judging the Song, then, in the light of this almost absolute identity of Theodotion with the Aramaic, we are forced to admit, as already indicated above, that the literary tradition of the two Greek texts is far from being correct, that the difference between Theodotion and LXX must have been more profound than is now the case, and that we shall have to recast the existing text of Theodotion and also that of the LXX, as both translations have exercised a mutually deteriorating influence upon each other, taking as basis for the reconstruction this Aramaic text, which, as I have tried to prove, is the original from which those translations have been made. The mistakes, which have their origin in wrong readings and misinterpretation, prove also conclusively that the original was Aramaic, and not Hebrew.

IV. TRANSLATION.

A. *The Song of the Three Children.*

V. 1. And the three went into the furnace of burning fire, praising and blessing the Lord. And Azariah stood up to pray, and he prayed thus; and he opened his mouth and said: V. 2. "Blessed be he, the God of our fathers, and be his name praised and glorified for evermore. V. 3. For thou art true in all that thou hast done to us, for all thy works are true, and thy ways established, and all thy judgments faithful. V. 4. Yea, true judgment hast thou wrought in all (*the things*) that thou hast brought upon us, and upon Jerusalem the holy city of our fathers, for true judgments hast thou brought upon us, because of our sins. V. 5. We have sinned, and we have committed iniquity, and we have departed (withdrawn) from thee. V. 6. And we have turned aside (trespassed) from all the commandments which thou hast commanded us, as we have not been willing to keep and to observe them, that it might go well with us. V. 7. And because we have not done (observed) thy commandments and statutes, V. 8. thou hast wrought true judgment in that thou hast delivered us into the hands of lawless enemies, and into the hands of wicked and lawless kings in all the lands. V. 9. And now we cannot open our mouths, for thy servants who cling to thee have become a shame. V. 10. And we

beseech thee not to deliver us up wholly, for the sake of thy great and holy name, neither to forget thy covenants. V. 11. And cause not thy mercy to depart from us, for the sake of Abraham thy beloved, and thy servant Isaac, and thy holy Israel. V. 12. To whom thou hadst spoken that (*thou wouldst*) multiply their children as the stars of heaven, and as the sand (*that lieth*) on the seashore. V. 13. And now we are become less than any other nation, as we are miserable (poor) this day in all the lands because of our sins. V. 14. And at this time we have neither a leader nor prophets, neither governors nor deputies, neither burnt-offerings nor sacrifices, nor oblations, as there is no place to bring all these before thee (*in order*) to find mercy. V. 15. But in a contrite heart and humble spirit let us be accepted like as burnt offerings and sacrifices of rams and bullocks, and like thousands of fat lambs. V. 16. Thus may our sacrifice to-day be acceptable in thy sight: for they shall not be confounded that put their trust in thee. V. 17. And now we desire with all our heart to fear thee. V. 18 and we pray unto thee, that thou puttest us not to shame, but that thou dealest with us after thy lovingkindness, and according to the multitude of thy mercy. V. 19. Deliver us and give glory to thy name, O Lord; and let all them that do thy servants hurt be ashamed. V. 20. And let them be confounded in (in spite of) all their power, and in (in spite of) their strength let them be broken. V. 21. And they shall know that thou alone art ruler over all the lands. V. 22. And now the servants of the king and his attendants, that threw the three men into the furnace, took naphtha, pitch and tow, and made balls, V. 23. in order to increase the flame of the fire 49 cubits above the furnace. V. 24. And the fire and the flame streamed forth and burnt them and every one of the Chaldeans that were standing by the side of the furnace. V. 25. And the angel of the Lord came down into the oven with Azariah and his fellows, and the fire of the oven cooled down. V. 26. And he made in the midst of the furnace like unto a wind that blew dew, and none of the fire touched them, nor were they hurt in any way. V. 27. Then those three with one mouth praised, and glorified and blessed God in the midst of the burning furnace, and said: V. 28. Blessed is the Lord God of our fathers, and to be praised and exalted for ever and ever. V. 29. And blessed be thy great and glorious and holy name, and praised and exalted over all the world. V. 30. Blessed art thou in thy holy temple, and to be praised and glorified over all the worlds. V. 31.

Blessed art thou upon the throne of thy glorious kingdom, and to be praised and exalted for ever and ever. V. 32. Blessed art thou, who hast lowered the abyss and sittest upon the cherubim and be praised and glorified in all the worlds. V. 33. Blessed art thou in the firmament of heavens, and be extolled and praised for ever. V. 34. O all ye works bless ye the Lord God, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 35. All ye angels bless ye the Lord God, praise him and exalt him over the world. V. 36. O ye waters that be above the heavens bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 37. All ye hosts of God, bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 38. O ye stars of heaven bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 39. O ye rain and dew bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 40. All ye winds of God, bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 41. O ye fire and heat, bless ye the Lord, O ye cold and warmth bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 42. O ye thunders and lightnings bless ye the Lord, O ye ice and frost bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 43. O ye vapours and clouds bless ye the Lord, O ye nights and days bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 44. O ye light and darkness bless ye the Lord, O ye dusk and dawn bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 45. O ye lands bless ye the Lord, O ye mountains and little hills bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 46. O all ye things that grow in the earth bless ye the Lord, O ye deep fountains bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 47. O ye seas and rivers bless ye the Lord, O ye fish and all that move in the waters bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 48. O all ye fowls of the heavens bless ye the Lord, O all ye beasts and cattle bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 49. O all ye children of men bless ye the Lord, O Israel bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 50. O ye priests of God bless ye the Lord, (*O ye servants of God, bless ye the Lord*), praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 51. O ye spirits and souls of the righteous bless ye the Lord, O ye holy and humble men of heart bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world. V. 52. O ye Hananyah, Azariah, and Mishael bless ye the Lord, praise him and exalt him in the world, for he hath delivered us from Sheol and saved us from the hand of death; for he delivered

us from the furnace of burning fire, and he hath saved us from burning fire and flames. V. 53. Give thanks unto the Lord, for he is good, as his mercies (*endure*) for ever, and bless ye the Lord of the World, he is God, praise him and exalt him in the world.

B. Daniel and the Dragon.

V. 1. And in that place there was a great and mighty dragon, which all the Babylonians worshipped. V. 2. And the king said unto Daniel, now thou canst not say that this here is no living god, therefore pray to him. V. 3. And Daniel answered and said unto the king, I pray only to the Lord God of my fathers, for he is a living God, mighty and awe-inspiring. V. 4. But if thou, O king, wilt give me leave, I will slay this dragon without lance or sword. V. 5. And the king said unto Daniel, I give thee now leave to do unto it all that thou wishest. 6. And Daniel went and took pitch and fat and flax and hair, and rolled them into one lump, and he made unto himself iron hatchets, and rolled all that round and round the hatchets, and he threw it into the dragon's mouth. V. 7. And it came to pass when the dragon had swallowed it and it had gone down into his stomach, the fat and pitch melted away from the hatchets, and the dragon was injured by the (spurs) points of the hatchet, and died. And Daniel said, lo, this is your god, whom you worshipped. V. 8. And when they of Babylon saw that the dragon was dead, they were all greatly incensed, and they gathered together and went up before the king, and they spake, saying, now we know that thou art like unto one of the Jewish men, for lo ! thou has destroyed Bel, and the dragon thou hast killed, and the priests of Bel thou hast broken up, together with his temple. V. 9. And now, if thou deliverest not Daniel into our hands, we will kill thee even in thine house. V. 10. Now when the king saw that they were all greatly incensed so that they wanted to kill him, he delivered Daniel unto them. V. 11. And they cast Daniel into the lions' pit, and he was there seven days. V. 12. For there was a pit in that place, in which there were seven lions, and they used to give them every day two carcasses, and two sheep ; and on that day they were not given to them, to the intent that they might devour Daniel. V. 13. The prophet Habakkuk was then in the land of Israel, and he sod a pottage to feed the reapers, and placed bread in his sack, and went to bring it to the reapers in the field. V. 14. And lo, the angel of

the Lord (*appeared*), and spoke to Habakkuk the prophet, saying, go and carry now this pottage which thou hast made to the town of Babylon, and give it to Daniel, who is in the lions' pit. V. 15. And the prophet Habakkuk answered and said to the angel, my lord, I have never seen the town of Babylon, neither do I know the lions' pit. V. 16. And the angel of the Lord took him by the neck and bore him by the lock of his head, and he set him with the food that he had in his hands over the mouth of the lions' pit which was in Babylon. V. 17. And when he recovered his breath, Habakkuk called Daniel, and said, take now this food which thy God has sent thee. V. 18. And Daniel praised and prayed, and said, O Lord God, thou hast remembered me, neither hast thou forsaken all those that love thee. V. 19. And Daniel arose and did eat; and the angel of the Lord carried Habakkuk back to his place in one hour. V. 20. And it came to pass on the seventh day that the king arose and went to the lions' pit to see Daniel, and he saw Daniel sitting in the den. V. 21. And the king cried with a loud and mighty voice, and said, the Lord God of Daniel, He is great and glorious. V. 22. And the king ordered to draw Daniel out from the lions' pit, and those men who had calumniated Daniel, the king ordered to cast them in there. And they cast them in the lions' pit, and the (*lions*) devoured them in a moment.

POSTSCRIPT.—I have since acquired a Hebrew Manuscript (now Cod. Hebr., 130 of my collection) written in a Spanish hand, of the end of the XVIth century. It is a collection of tales. One among these (No. 72 f. 162a-165a) is now the Hebrew translation of the Syriac text of *Bel and the Dragon*, published by Dr. Neubauer, from the *Midrash Rabba de-Rabba*. (The book of Tobit, Oxford, 1878, p. 39-43). This translation is as literal as possible, therefore of no small importance for the criticism of that text, especially as it contains a few remarkable variations. I select only one, as it corroborates the reading of our Aramaic text in one of the most interesting variants. V. 13 reads in this MS.: "Now Habakkuk was a prophet in Judah, and he had in his hands a pottage (seething) and in his *knapsack* bread, to bring to the reapers in the field:" וחבוקק היה נביא בארץ יהודה ובידו תבשיל ובאמתחתו לחם להביא לקוצרים בשדה; agreeing thus exactly with the Aramaic, in that Habakkuk carried the bread in a *sack*, and in nothing else, although the Hebrew-Syriac text has also the word עורבא for it.

LONDON:
HARRISON AND SONS, PRINTERS IN ORDINARY TO HER MAJESTY,
ST. MARTIN'S LANE.